

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

No claims are amended herein. Claims 1-7 and 30-35 remain pending and stand rejected.

In the May 11, 2009 office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,658,272 to Lenchik et al. (hereinafter 'Lenchik'). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection since Lenchik clearly fails to teach or suggest each element of claims 1, 3, 4 and 30.

The Examiner cites elements of the joint 112 as describing "a direction detecting section comprising at least one magnet fixed within the mobile terminal and a plurality of sensors for detecting the magnet in order to detect the direction in which the mobile terminal is turned and generating a first direction detecting signal, a second direction detecting signal, a third direction detecting signal, and a fourth direction detecting signal." More specifically, the Examiner presumably refers to position sensors 1035 (see FIG. 10) as the claimed "plurality of sensors", and connector element 903 as the "at least one magnet fixed within the mobile terminal." Clearly, the element 903 is not described as a magnet. However, the Examiner also cites FIG. 13 and the corresponding text as describing a magnet.


FIGs 11-13 describe different embodiments of position sensors for use in the joint 112 of Lenchik. FIG. 13 corresponds to a magnet and Hall Effect sensor embodiment. However, it is clear that Lenchik describes each Hall Effect sensor as working in connection with a corresponding magnet to produce an electrical signal that a corresponding position sensor can use to determine a relative position.

However, Lenchik clearly fails to teach or suggest a plurality of sensors for detecting a particular magnet, as recited in independent claims 1, 4, and 30. In embodiments of the present invention, one magnet is detected by a plurality of sensors in order to determine relative position, unlike Lenchik, which requires a separate magnet and Hall Effect sensor for each position sensor. Accordingly, since Lenchik fails to teach or describe “a plurality of sensors for detecting the magnet” the rejection of independent claims 1, 4 and 30 must be withdrawn. Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and is allowable at least for the reasons discussed above.

The Examiner’s reasoning with respect to Lenchik is repeated in the remaining rejections of claims 2, 5-7, and 31-35. Independent claims 6 and 33 also include the recitation: “a plurality of sensors for detecting the magnet.” Accordingly, the Examiner’s reasoning is flawed with respect to the remaining claims for the same reasons discussed above, regardless of what the Examiner relies on the secondary references as teaching. Accordingly each of the remaining rejections must be withdrawn, since Lenchik is relied on, and at least fails to teach or suggest “a plurality of sensors for detecting the magnet.”

In view of the above, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'C. Michel', written over a horizontal line.

Christian C. Michel
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 46,300

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 659-9076
Dated: August 4, 2009